

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-16, 18-33, and 46-50 are presented for examination. Claim 1 has been amended. No further claims have been added or canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16, 18-33, and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al), U.S. Patent No. 6,742,043 (Moussa et al), and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,215 (Bakshi et al.).

Rabe-Hesketh discloses removing an email attachment and replacing the attachment with a link in the email. The link references the original attachment stored in a server available for later retrieval. Nonetheless, as correctly stated in the Office action, Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest formatting attachments based on a user's formatting preference.

Moussa is directed at reformatting and delivering a requested attachment based on information indicative of an email client's capability (Moussa, Col. 16, lines 28-31). The email client makes a request for an email along with information indicative of the email client's capability (Moussa, col. 16, lines 34-46). The email server reformats the email attachment and sends the email with the reformatted email attachment to the email client (Moussa, col. 16, lines 50-62). However, Moussa does not disclose substituting a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

Bakshi discloses software a user uses to determine download preferences (Bakshi, Fig. 3, Col. 7, lines 7-40). The download preferences are used to indicate a preference for transcoding by a network proxy that sends content to the network client

(Bakshi, Col. 7, lines 19-28). These preferences are sent to a network proxy either before or when the network client requests content (Col. 3, lines 30-47). This software is downloaded from a network proxy or transcoding server (Col. 8, lines 5-15). Thus, Bakshi discloses a network client that sends user set transformation parameters with a request to download content. However, Bakshi does not teach or suggest a link for the requested content that is invoked by the network client that includes transcoding preferences.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

In an online messaging system supporting transmission of attachments, a method for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising:

specifying a preference for formatting attachments that accompany e-mail messages;

receiving, with a server, a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment;

detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message;

responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the particular attachment as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, removing the particular attachment from the particular message, and inserting a link into the particular e-mail message, said link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the specified preferences and said link further includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment, and wherein the transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device;

delivering the particular e-mail message to the intended recipient; and

in response to invocation of the link by the intended recipient, receiving a request for a copy of the reformatted attachment, wherein the request includes an identification of the reformatted attachment and the transformation parameters.

(Claim 1, as amended) Claim 1 recites a link in an email referencing a reformatted email attachment that “includes ... transformation parameters that ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.” This feature is supported in the Specification as originally filed, for example in Figure 6, block 601 and at page 16, lines 9-11; page 37, lines 23-28.

The Examiner correctly admits that neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa disclose a link in an email for a reformatted email attachment. Thus, because neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa teach or suggest a request that includes transformation parameters, neither reference can teach or suggest a link in an email referencing a reformatted email attachment that includes transformation parameters that “are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.”

Bakshi discloses a network client that sends user determined transformation parameters with a request to download content. The network client adds the transformation parameters as these transformation parameters are not in the original link for the content invoked by the network client. In addition, Bakshi’s transformation parameters are user determined and are not based on the capabilities of the recipient device. Thus, Bakshi does not disclose transformation parameters based on the recipient device, and Bakshi does not teach or suggest a request for a link for a reformatted email attachment that “includes ... transformation parameters that ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.”

Thus, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests a link in an email referencing a reformatted email attachment that “includes ... transformation parameters that ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving

device.” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, and claims 2-25 that depend on claim 1, is not obvious over the combination of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Claim 26 as amended recites:

In an online system, a method for providing digital images to target devices, the method comprising:
receiving an e-mail message having one or more attached objects;
detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;
responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, detaching said objects from said message;
for each detached object, generating a request allowing retrieval of a transformed copy of the detached object, wherein the generated request includes an identification of the transformed copy of the detached object and transformation parameters that indicate how to transform that detached object to the transformed copy of the detached object, and wherein the transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device;
automatically transforming copies of said objects to a resolution fidelity that is more useful to said target devices based on the transformation parameters; and
delivering the e-mail message to the target devices, the e-mail message including said generated request for each detached object.

(Claim 26, emphasis added). As noted above, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests “the generated request includes ... transformation parameters ... based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.” Therefore, claim 26, and claims 27-33 that depend on claim 26, is not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Claim 46 recites:

An e-mail system for providing e-mail having attachments, the system comprising:

an e-mail server for:

receiving a particular e-mail message having an attachment, the particular e-mail message being addressed to a recipient having a target device capable of receiving e-mail, the attachment including one or more objects, and

detecting capabilities of the target device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;

a transformation module for transforming the objects of the attachment to a desired format, based on capabilities of the target device; and

an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at least one request responsive to detecting the target device and responsive to identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device, wherein the at least one request allows retrieval of at least one of the transformed objects and the at least one request includes an identification of the at least one of the transformed objects and transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the at least one of the transformed objects, and wherein the transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device;

a retrieval module allowing retrieval of the transformed objects, in response to invocation of at least one request.

(Claim 46, emphasis added). As noted above, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests "at least one request includes an identification of at least one of the transformation parameters ... transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device." Therefore, claim 46 and claims 47-50 that depend on claim 46 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Feb. 16, 2010

/Eric S. Replogle/

Eric S. Replogle
Reg. No. 52,161

Customer No. 08791
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300